

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/678,397	10/03/2003	James D. McLean	7784-000596	3523		
27572	7590 07/01/2004		EXAMINER			
HARNESS	, DICKEY & PIERC	ELDRED, JOHN W				
P.O. BOX 82	28 LD HILLS, MI 4830:		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
BLOOMI IL	ED INEES, IVII 4050.	,	3644	3644		

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)	/			
Office Action Summary		10/678,39	7	MCLEAN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit	1//			
		J. Woodrov		3644	V /			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a)□	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Qua	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application	n.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.							
·								
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election re	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the i	Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action of form PTC	J-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
***	44-2							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)								
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-67-04, 10-3-03. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:								

Application/Control Number: 10/678,397 Page 2

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lotz et al in view of Grant.

Lotz et al disclose an airfoil comprising a leading airfoil element with upper and lower surfaces, a trailing airfoil with upper and lower surfaces, and a slot defined by the airfoil during a transonic condition of the airfoil where the slot allows a portion of the air flowing along the lower surface of the leading airfoil element to split and flow over the upper surface of the trailing airfoil element. See especially Figure 1b and column 5, lines 25-35. Lotz et al fail to specify that the airfoil is "swept" or that the slot is "full-span". Grant teaches, see especially Figure 1, that it is well known in an aircraft to have both swept wings and a full-span slot. Motivation to combine is the specification of a particular, i.e. swept, wing for an unspecified type, with the attendant advantages of great efficiency at high speeds. Likewise, the full-span slot and trailing airfoil allows greater control due to larger reacting areas of the airfoil. To employ the teachings of Grant on the airfoil of Lotz et al and have a swept wing with a full-span slot is considered to have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Art Unit: 3644

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Page 3

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of copending Application No. 10/678,474. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they claim the same airfoil elements in slightly different language.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Steidl, Zimmer, and Hendrickson are cited as being of interest since they disclose slotted airfoils.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Woodrow Eldred whose telephone number is 703-306-4151. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Woodrow Eldred
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3644

. Woodron *Elled*

JWE